## Interview Summary

Application No. 09/359,809

Levy, Richard

Examiner

Margaret B. Medley

Group Art Unit 1714



) Margaret B. Medley	(3)
Attorney Robert J. Eichelburg	
pate of Interview Oct 31, 2000	
	— — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —
ype: 🛛 Telephonic 🗌 Personal (copy i	s given to applicant applicant a ropi seasons.
xhibit shown or demonstration conducted:	☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:
agreement 🛛 was reached. 🗌 was not r	eached.
Claim(s) discussed: All of record	
dentification of prior art discussed:	
Vone	
Evaminer indicated that a reconsideration o	nted that the eleven-way resrtriction requirement was unwarrented. The state of the restriction requirement would be made and a new restriction requirement.
would be issued	f the restriction requirement would be made and a war-
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a cothe claims allowable must be attached. All is available, a summary thereof must be at	opy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render so, where no copy of the amendents which would render the claims allowable trached.)
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a conthe claims allowable must be attached. All is available, a summary thereof must be at 1.   It is not necessary for applicant to	opy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render so, where no copy of the amendents which would render the claims allowable trached.)  provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a conthe claims allowable must be attached. All is available, a summary thereof must be at 1.   It is not necessary for applicant to Unless the paragraph above has been check LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED A Section 713.04). If a response to the last EROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A	opy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render so, where no copy of the amendents which would render the claims allowable trached.)  I provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.  Coked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE ND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a conthe claims allowable must be attached. All is available, a summary thereof must be at 1.   It is not necessary for applicant to Unless the paragraph above has been check LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AS Section 713.04). If a response to the last FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A  2.   Since the Examiner's interview sure each of the objections, rejections.	opy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render so, where no copy of the amendents which would render the claims allowable stached.)  provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.  Cked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE

Interview Summary

## **Interview Summary**

Application No. 09/359,809

Levy, Richard

Examiner

Margaret B. Medley

Group Art Unit 1714



participants (applicant, applicant's representative, P  Margaret B. Medley	(3)
Attorney Robert J. Eichelburg	(4)
te of InterviewSept 26, 2000	
te of Interview	
pe: 🛚 Telephonic 🔝 Personal (copy is given to	applicant applicant's representative,
hibit shown or demonstration conducted:   \[ \sum Yes \]	No. If yes, brief description:  ■ The state of the s
greement 🛛 was reached. 🗌 was not reached.	
aim(s) discussed: <u>All of record</u>	
entification of prior art discussed:	
one	
equiremnet, Paper No. 4, mailed on 301y 12, 2000	d to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: <u>estriction requirement would be mailed to replace the restriction</u> <u>On September 26, 2000 Applicant's representative indicated that</u> <u>ented. The Examiner indicated that a reconsideration of the restriction</u> <u>equirement would be issued.</u>
Applicant's representitive was information of the equiremnet, Paper No. 4, mailed on July 12, 2000. The eleven-way restriction requirement was unwarring equirement would be made and a new restriction requirement.	On September 26, 2000 Applicant's representative indicated that entered. The Examiner indicated that a reconsideration of the restriction
the eleven-way restriction requirement was unwarranged in sury 12, 200 and the eleven-way restriction requirement would be made and a new restriction requirement would be requirement would be requirement would be requirement when restriction requirement would be requirement which we require the restriction requiremen	On September 26, 2000 Applicant's representative indicated that ented. The Examiner indicated that a reconsideration of the restriction equirement would be issued.  The amendments if available, which the examiner agreed would render the no copy of the amendents which would render the claims allowable
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)  1.   It is not necessary for applicant to provide the chains allowable must be sheep checked to in the chains allowable.	On September 26, 2000 Applicant's representative indicated that a reconsideration of the restriction equirement would be issued.  e amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the no copy of the amendents which would render the claims allowable a separate record of the substance of the interview.  Indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP)
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the the claims allowable must be attached.)  1. It is not necessary for applicant to provide Unless the paragraph above has been checked to in LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUS Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office a	On September 26, 2000 Applicant's representative indicated that ented. The Examiner indicated that a reconsideration of the restriction equirement would be issued.  The amendments if available, which the examiner agreed would render the no copy of the amendents which would render the claims allowable a separate record of the substance of the interview.  This is a substance of the interview. (See MPEP INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.)
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the the claims allowable must be attached.)  1. It is not necessary for applicant to provide Unless the paragraph above has been checked to in LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUS Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office a FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEM  2. Since the Examiner's interview summary as the of the objections rejections and requirement was unwarred.	On September 26, 2000 Applicant's representative indicated that a reconsideration of the restriction ented. The Examiner indicated that a reconsideration of the restriction equirement would be issued.  The end of the amendants which the examiner agreed would render the no copy of the amendants which would render the claims allowable a separate record of the substance of the interview.  The end of the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPER TINCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.)